



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

54

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,946	02/09/2001	Christopher Brian Dwyer	987P011	1707
26568	7590	03/09/2005	EXAMINER	
COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER LTD SUITE 2850 200 WEST ADAMS STREET CHICAGO, IL 60606			APPIAH, CHARLES NANA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/780,946	DWYER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Charles Appiah	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 0901.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Double Patenting***

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101, which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/363,749. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claims 40-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation of the limitation "said direct dial-up connection protocol" in claims 40, 45 and 50 lacks prior antecedent basis in the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Aho (US 2001/005675)**.

Regarding claim 1, Aho discloses a method of delivering a message to a wireless device, comprising the steps of: associating a first number with the device, the first number included within a true address for communication with the device (internal identifier of the cellular network relating to the wireless terminal, such as User ID, see page 4, 0056-0057), associating a second number with the device, the second number being distinct from the first number and not being included within the true address (use of MMS-ID to identify the wireless terminal, see pages 3-4, 0053 and pages 4-5, 0058-0062), receiving a communication that includes a phantom address and a message, at least a portion of the phantom address including the second number (see page 3, 0053), deriving the true address by at least deriving the first number from the second number (see page 4, 0056-0060), and delivering the message to the device based upon the derived true address (transfer of multimedia message from the MMSC to the wireless terminal MS being started, (block 36a) of Fig. 3, page 4, 0053).

Regarding claim 2, Aho further teaches wherein the wireless device is a wireless telephone (see MS of Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 5, Aho further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device (internal identifier of the cellular network relating to the wireless terminal, such as User ID, see page 4, 0056-0057).

Regarding claim 7, Aho further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (MMS-ID being used for multimedia service, see page 4, 0056-0058).

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Adams et al. (6,823,060)**.

Regarding claim 1, Adams discloses a method of delivering a message to a wireless device, comprising the steps of: associating a first number with the device, the first number included within a true address for communication with the device (MIN as returned to the MSC, col. 5, lines 65-66), associating a second number with the device, the second number being distinct from the first number and not being included within the true address (dialed number), receiving a communication that includes a phantom address and a message, at least a portion of the phantom address including the second number (receiving query having at least one parameter, the parameter being the dialed digits at SCP, col. 5, lines 39-40), deriving the true address by at least deriving the first number from the second number (searching for entry in UPD table, col. 5, lines 40-66), and delivering the message to the device based upon the derived true address (use of located target number to send message from MSC, see col. 5, lines 66-67). See Fig. 3.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Gould et al. (6,570,489)**.

Regarding claim 1, Gould discloses a method of delivering a message to a wireless device, comprising the steps of: associating a first number with the device, the first number included within a true address for communication with the device (see col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 2), associating a second number with the device (col. 2, lines 51-55), the second number being distinct from the first number and not being included within the true address (see col. 2, lines 55-59), receiving a communication that includes a phantom address and a message, at least a portion of the phantom address including the second number (see col. 2, lines 51-55), deriving the true address by at least deriving the first number from the second number (see col. 2, lines 60-65), and delivering the message to the device based upon the derived true address (see col. 3, lines 40-61, col. 5, lines 26-28 ). See Figs. 2A-2B.

Regarding claims 2 and 3 Gould further discloses wherein the wireless device is a wireless telephone (wireless telephone 90) or a page-receiving device (pager receiving device 10). See Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device as well as activate calls for the wireless telephone (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 6, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main pager number that activates paging signals for the page-receiving device (see col. 4, lines 37-55).

Regarding claim 7, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

Regarding claim 8, Gould further discloses wherein the true address is the first number (see Col. 3, lines 16-21).

Regarding claim 9, Gould further discloses wherein the phantom address is the second number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

Regarding claim 10, Gould further discloses wherein the step of deriving the true address is carried out by merely deriving the first number from the second number (see col. 4, lines 2-14).

Regarding claims 55-57, Gould discloses a communications system, and a method permitting maintenance of a telephone number (pager number) used to activate telephone calls (initiate pages) for a wireless telephone (page receiving device) comprising: a wireless device having a first number (main pager number) associated therewith (assigned internal identification of wireless telephones and/or wired telephones, see col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 2), and a second number (auxiliary page number) associated therewith (external pager identification, col. 2, lines 51-55), the first number included within a true address for communication with the wireless device, the second number being distinct from the first number and not being included within the true address (identification of end terminal using internal terminal identification independent of the external pager identifications used by the external pager message,

see col. 2, lines 55-59), means for receiving a communication that includes a phantom address and a message at least a portion of the phantom address including the second number (reception of external alphanumeric pager messages that include a header with the recipient's external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-55), means for deriving the true address by at least deriving the first number from the second number (system controller extracting the external pager identification of the recipient's pager device and mapping or relating the extracted pager identification to a corresponding internal identification of a recipient end terminal using a database or look-up table, see col. 2, lines 60-65), and means for delivering the message to the device based upon the derived true address (after determining internal identification of the recipient's end terminal, routing of external pager message to recipient's end terminal, (see col. 3, lines 40-61). See Figs. 2A-2B.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-14, 16-21, and 23-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Kotola et al. (WO 98/11744)**.

Regarding claim 11-14, 20 and 21 Gould further discloses wherein the message can be displayed and viewed on the recipient's end terminal (see col. 4, lines 39-42) but

fails to teach wherein the message is formatted as a short message service text message when it is delivered and the message included within the communication is formatted in accordance with a TCP/IP protocol, wherein the TCP/IP protocol is an SMTP protocol, HTTP protocol, and the message is an electronic mail message, or a web-based message.

Kotola discloses a system for providing data service in a mobile communication system in which short message including an identifier indicating a World wide Web page in an Internet network is transferred to a short message center using the protocols of the Internet (see page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 30), such as TCP/IP and HTTP protocols (see page 4, lines 1-6), SMTP protocol (page 7, lines 5-11), and the message is an electronic mail message or web-based message (see page 10, lines 10-35). According to Kotola, using the Internet in conjunction with short message service to provide data transmission services allows users of mobile stations without any data transmission facilities to be offered information from numerous information sources (see page 2, lines 6-34).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine Kotola's data service provision system with Gould's integrated telephone and pager communication system in order to ensure the provision of a wide range of information available on the World Wide Web via the Internet to mobile subscribers.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device, the wireless device is a wireless

telephone and the first number also activate calls for the wireless telephone (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 18, Gould further discloses wherein the wireless device is a page-receiving device (pager receiving device 10, see Fig. 1), and the first number corresponds to a main pager number that activates paging signals for the page-receiving device (see col. 4, lines 37-55).

Regarding claim 19, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device, the wireless device is a wireless telephone and the first number also activate calls for the wireless telephone (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 25, Gould further discloses wherein the wireless device is a page-receiving device (pager receiving device 10, see Fig. 1), and the first number corresponds to a main pager number that activates paging signals for the page-receiving device (see col. 4, lines 37-55).

Regarding claim 26, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

8. Claims 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al and Kotola et al** as applied to claims 13 and 20 above, and further in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)**.

Regarding claims 15 and 22, the combination of Gould and Kotola fail to explicitly teach wherein the true address corresponds to an electronic mail true address and the phantom address corresponds to an electronic mail phantom address.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with Gould and Kotola's system in order to ensure the use of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

9. Claims 27, 28, 29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al and Kotola et al** as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of **Scott (US 2001/0044820)**.

Regarding claim 27 and 28 Gould as modified by Kotola discloses the use of TCP/IP protocol as taught by Kotola (see page 9, lines 1-8) but fails to teach the use of SNPP protocol and wherein the message is a voice mail notification.

Scott discloses a system and method for monitoring and detecting changes to static, dynamic and active web content wherein two-way communication systems/protocols, including, but not limited to interactive voice response (IVR) system is used to notify the specific contact person(s), SMTP, SNPP and two-way paging, give users the ability to interact with a web manager (see page 5, 0046-0047). According to Scott TCP/IP is the language of the Internet and that an entire suite of Internet protocols are known collectively as TCP/IP (see page 1, 0007-0009)

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the TCP/IP protocol features of Scott such as SNPP and voice messaging capability with the system of Gould and Kotola in order to provide proper interaction and the provision of a wide range of information available on the World Wide Web via the Internet to mobile subscribers.

Regarding claim 29, Gould further discloses wherein the message is a pager notification (see col. 4, lines 37-55).

Regarding claim 31, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 32, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

10. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al, Kotola et al and Scott** as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)**.

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Gould and Kotola as modified by Scott fail to explicitly teach wherein the true address corresponds to an electronic mail true address and the phantom address corresponds to an electronic mail phantom address.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with Gould and Kotola's system as modified by Scott in order to ensure the use of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

11. Claims 33, 34, 35, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al and Kotola et al** as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of **Lorello et al. (6,208,870)**.

Regarding claims 33 and 34, the combination of Gould and Kotola meet all limitations as applied to claim 12 above, with Kotola disclosing the use of TCP/IP protocol (see page 9, lines 1-8), but fails to teach the use of SMPP protocol and wherein the message is a voice mail notification.

Lorello discloses an apparatus and method for facilitating short message service messages to a subscriber in a wireless communication network that allows the inclusion of multiple SMSCs without requiring significant and complex modification to the remaining SMS network elements (see col. 6, lines 14-23), and allows for the use of any suitable mechanism for the particular SMS network, TCP/IP, SMPP mechanism or any other point-to-point and/or peer-to-peer messaging mechanisms (see col. 10, lines 49-63). According to Lorello, a message delivery request may include an identifier that identifies the type of SMS message, e.g., a cellular messaging teleservice, a cellular paging teleservice or voice mail notification teleservice (see col. 11, lines 11-28).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the optional use of any suitable mechanism for a particular short message service network of Lorello with Gould and Kotola in order have a more reliable and robust method for delivering pending short messages to a subscriber from a plurality of SMSCs.

Regarding claim 35, Gould as modified by Kotola and Lorello further discloses wherein the message is a pager notification (see Gould, col. 4, lines 37-55 and col. 11, lines 18-21 of Lorello).

Regarding claim 37, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 38, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

12. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al, Kotola et al and Lorello et al** as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)**.

Regarding claim 36, the combination of Gould, Kotola and Lorello fail to explicitly teach wherein the true address corresponds to an electronic mail true address and the phantom address corresponds to an electronic mail phantom address.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with the system of Gould, Kotola and Lorello in order to ensure the use

of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

13. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Hsieh et al. (6,192,034)**.

Regarding claim 39, Gould fails to explicitly disclose wherein the message included within the communication is formatted in accordance with a direct dial-up connection protocol.

Hsieh discloses a system in which a plurality of network elements and software elements are interconnected in a network having the ability to monitor software applications and hardware devices executing on an electronic commerce network in real time (see col. 1, line 46 to col. 2, line 19). According to Hsieh, a processing engine includes a multipurpose Internet messaging extension, a gateway that converts messages to and from different formats and also includes a connection that can provide direct dial-up connection that allows messages to be stored and provided and transferred (see col. 2, line 55 to col. 3, line 36).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to provide for the capability of using direct dial-up connection protocol for sending and receiving messages in Gould's system as taught by Hsieh.

14. Claims 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al** and **Kotola et al** as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of **Meares, Jr. (5,272,465)**.

Regarding claims 40, 41, 45 and 46, the combination of Gould and Kotola fail to specifically teach wherein the direct dial-up connection protocol is a TAP protocol and a PET protocol and the message is an alphanumeric paging message.

Meares discloses the use of PET/TAP protocol through direct dial-up to communicate page data for alarm communications (see col. 2, lines 3-35, col. 3, lines 3-22, col. 4, lines 54-57). According to Meares, the PET/TAP alphanumeric protocol was specifically designed to permit automatic page entry to digital alphanumeric pages (see col. 6, lines 20-49).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the PET/TAP direct dial up PET/TAP protocol of Meares with the system of Gould and Kotola in order to ensure the capability of permitting automatic page entry to digital alphanumeric pages for sending full detailed paging or text messages as taught by Meares.

Regarding claims 43 and 48, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claims 44 and 49, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

15. Claims 42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al, Kotola et al and Meares et al** as applied to claims 40 and 45 above, and further in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)**.

Regarding claims 42 and 47, the combination of Gould, Kotola and Meares fail to explicitly teach wherein the true address corresponds to an electronic mail true address and the phantom address corresponds to an electronic mail phantom address.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with the system of Gould, Kotola and Meares in order to ensure the use of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

**16.** Claims 50, 51, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al and Kotola et al** as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of **Espeut et al. (5,657,376)**.

Regarding claims 50 and 51, the combination of Gould and Kotola fail to specifically disclose wherein the direct dial-up connection protocol is a TNPP protocol.

Espeut discloses an architecture for voice messaging in which a voice message processor can generate a page and transmit the page directly to a paging terminal using for example a Telecator Network Paging Protocol (TNPP) format for transmitting alphanumeric paging messages (see col. 11, lines 25-48).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any paging industry standard protocol such as TNPP as taught by Espeut with the system of Gould and Kotola in order to ensure the capability of communicating between paging switches and other paging network elements supporting one way alphanumeric paging for transmission of paging messages appropriately.

Regarding claim 53, Gould further discloses wherein the first number corresponds to a main number to activate the device (see col. 3, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 54, Gould further discloses wherein the second number corresponds to a universal contact number (recipient's telephone number or external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-54).

17. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al, Kotola et al and Espeut et al** as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)**.

Regarding claim 52, the combination of Gould, Kotola and Espeut fail to explicitly teach wherein the true address corresponds to an electronic mail true address and the phantom address corresponds to an electronic mail phantom address.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination

address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with the system of Gould, Kotola and Espeut in order to ensure the use of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

**18.** Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al. (6,570,489)** in view of **Gabber et al. (6,591,291)** and further in view of **Kotola et al. (WO 98/11744)**.

Regarding claim 58, Gould discloses a method for delivering messages to a wireless handset, comprising the steps of: assigning both a main telephone number (assigned internal identification number, see col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 2), and an auxiliary telephone number to a wireless telephone (external pager identification, see col. 2, lines 51-53), the auxiliary telephone number being distinct from the main telephone number assigned to the wireless telephone which activates calls for the wireless telephone (see col. 3, lines 41-61). Gould discloses receiving a communication message that is addressed to the auxiliary telephone number (see col. 2, lines 51-55),

and translating the address corresponding to the auxiliary telephone number into data corresponding to the main telephone number (see col. 2, lines 60-65), and after determining internal identification of the recipient's end terminal, routing of external pager message to recipient's end terminal, (see col. 3, lines 40-61, Figs. 2A-2B). Gould fails to disclose that the message received is an electronic mail message address to an electronic mail address having part corresponding to the auxiliary telephone number, and translating the part of the electronic mail address corresponding to the auxiliary telephone number into data corresponding to the main telephone number.

Gabber discloses a system and method for generating an alias address for an electronic mail (e-mail) message having a real source address and a destination address (see abstract). According to Gabber, an alias source address includes an encrypted version of the real source address such that an e-mail forwarder can compute the real source address given the alias source address without any need for a translation table from alias source address to real source addresses and this ensures consistency, uniqueness and privacy in forwarding electronic mails (see col. 3, lines 9-51).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the use of an alias source address for sending electronic mails with the system of Gould, Kotola and Lorello in order to ensure the use of a consistent and unique alias address generation system that ensures privacy in electronic messaging as taught by Gabber.

The combination of Gould and Gabber fail to discloses converting the electronic mail message into a short message service text message and transmitting the short message service text message to the wireless telephone.

Kotola discloses a system for providing data service in a mobile communication system in which short message including an identifier indicating a World wide Web page in an Internet network is transferred to a short message center using the protocols of the Internet (see page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 30), such as TCP/IP and HTTP protocols (see page 4, lines 1-6), SMTP protocol (page 7, lines 5-11), and the message is an electronic mail message or web-based message (see page 10, lines 10-35). According to Kotola, using the Internet in conjunction with short message service to provide data transmission services allows users of mobile stations without any data transmission facilities to be offered information from numerous information sources (see page 2, lines 6-34).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine Kotola's data service provision system with Gould's integrated telephone and pager communication system in order to ensure the provision of a wide range of information available on the World Wide Web via the Internet to mobile subscribers.

### ***Conclusion***

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Collins et al. (6,424,828) discloses a system, which an Internet

server allows a cellular telephone to acquire a short message service address for an Internet station.

Ranalli et al. (6,539,077) discloses a an apparatus for correlating a unique identifier, such as a PSTN telephone number to an Internet address to enable communications over the Internet.

Calamera et al. (6,463,533) discloses a system for generating site-specific user aliases in a computer network.

Zellner et al. (6,738,808) discloses the use of dummy identifications for anonymous location service in a wireless network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Appiah whose telephone number is 703 305-4772. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 703 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CA



CHARLES APPIAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER